



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/920,707	08/02/2001	Ben Byrd	41872-206195	6769

7590 11/14/2003

J. Michael Boggs
Kilpatrick Stockton LLP
1001 West Fourth Street
Winston-Salem, NC 27101-2400

EXAMINER

PATTERSON, MARIE D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3728

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2003

11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/920,707

Applicant(s)

BYRD, BEN

Examiner

Marie Patterson

Art Unit

3728

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-18, 20-29 and 31-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-18, 20-29, and 31-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5, 7, 9-12, 14-18, 20, 22-25, 27-29, and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berger (5084988).

Berger shows shoe soles and method of using shoe soles having a heel indicator (boundary between elements 4 and 5), and a plurality of calibrated lines (6 and boundary between elements 3 and 5) with indicia comprising calibrated numbers and/or lines (6 and 7, see column 3 lines 1-10) substantially as claimed except for the exact indicia. Standard shoe sizes are a type of well known and conventional calibrated marking. It is also noted that "Where sole distinction set out in the claims over prior art is in printed matter, there being no new feature of physical structure and no new relation of printed matter to physical structure, such claims may not be allowed; it is only where claims define either new features of structure or new relations of printed matter to structure, or both, which new features or new relations give rise to some new and useful function, effect, or result, that claims may be allowed" and "sole different over art being in printed matter (indicia), different in substance, language, or meaning of the same whether generally accepted or arbitrary, cannot serve to impart patentability". (Ex parte Gwinn, 112 USPQ 439-449). It would have been obvious to use any calibrated markings, including the well known and conventional shoe size calibrated markings (especially since the article is a shoe), for

the calibrated lines/indicia on the shoe sole and in the method of Berger to allow the user to easily locate a shoe in the right shoe size range.

3. Claims 8, 13, 21, 26, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berger in view of either Rosen (4931773) or Sigoloff (4712314).

Berger as modified/discussed above shows a shoe soles and method of using such substantially as claimed except for providing a transparent layer over the bottom of the outsole. Rosen or Sigoloff teaches providing a transparent layer (34 or 26) on an outsole over an area of indicia. It would have been obvious to provide a transparent layer as taught by Rosen or Sigoloff in the shoes and method of Berger to increase the durability and to make the indicia easier to read after the shoes have been worn.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 10/9/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicants' arguments directed towards the calibrated markings of Berger, shoe size calibrated markings would have been clearly an obvious choice in view of the article being a shoe. In fact it may be unobvious to use a different type of calibrated marking. It is also noted that "Where sole distinction set out in the claims over prior art is in printed matter, there being no new feature of physical structure and no new relation of printed matter to physical structure, such claims may not be allowed; it is only where claims define either new features of structure or new relations of printed matter to structure, or both, which new features or new relations give

Art Unit: 3728

rise to some new and useful function, effect, or result, that claims may be allowed” and “sole different over art being in printed matter (indicia), different is substance, language, or meaning of the same whether generally accepted or arbitrary, cannot serve to impart patentability”. (Ex parte Gwinn, 112 USPQ 439-449).

1. Telephone inquiries regarding the status of application or other general questions, by persons entitled to the information, “should be directed to the group clerical personnel and not to the Examiners. In as much as the official records and applications are located in the clerical section of the examining groups, the clerical personnel can readily provide status information without contacting the examiners”, M.P.E.P. 203.08. The Group clerical receptionist number is (703) 308-1148 or the **Tech Center 3700 Customer Service Center number is (703) 306-5648**. For applicant's convenience, the Group Technological Center FAX number is (703) 872-9306. (Note that the Examiner **cannot** confirm receipt of faxes) Please identify Examiner ____ of Art Unit ____ at the top of your cover sheet of any correspondence submitted.

Inquiries only concerning the **merits** of the examination should be directed to Marie Patterson whose telephone number is (703) 308-0069.

If in receiving this Office Action it is apparent to applicant that certain documents are missing, e.g. copies of references cited, form PTO-1449, for PTO-892, etc. requests for copies of such papers should be directed to (703) 308-1337.

Check out our web-site at “www.uspto.gov” for fees and other useful information.



Marie Patterson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3728